



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,682	12/14/2005	Wilhelmus Franciscus Johanne Fontijn	NL 030687	8504
24737 7590 11/25/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510				
EXAMINER				
SCHNEE, HAL W				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2186				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/25/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/560,682

Applicant(s)

FONTIJN ET AL.

Examiner

HAL SCHNEE

Art Unit

2186

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-29, 31 and 33-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 15-29, 31 and 33-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/808)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-13, 15-29, 31, and 33-35 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 21, and 26 are amended; Claims 30 and 32 are cancelled; and Claims 33-35 are new by applicant's amendment filed 21 October 2008.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 21-29, 31, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding Claims 21 and 26, they recite “. . . the file having the one format” (last two lines). However, both claims previously recite “one of a logical format and an application format” (Claim 21, lines 4-5, for example). There is no way to determine which “one format” is intended by the last two lines of the claims. In contrast to similar Claim 1, the phrase “the one format” does not appear to fit the context of the present claims. For the purpose of examination under prior art, the examiner will disregard the phrase “having the one format.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3, 4, 9, 10, 13, 15, 26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heo et al. (U.S. Patent 6,901,210, hereinafter referred to as “Heo”) in view of Ballantyne (U.S. Patent 6,693,869), further in view of Abboud et al. (U.S. Patent 6,636,958, hereinafter referred to as “Abboud”), and further in view of Puri et al. (U.S. Patent 6,260,043, hereinafter referred to as “Puri”).
6. Claim 1 is being treated under 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph as it invokes means-plus-function language as described in MPEP § 2181.

Regarding Claim 1, Heo teaches a drive device for providing access to a record carrier (fig. 3; col. 4, lines 39-45), said drive device comprising access means for providing at least one of a read access and a write access to at least one predetermined parameter written on a predetermined navigation area (DN) on said record carrier, said at least one predetermined parameter specifying at least one of a logical format and an application format used on said record carrier (fig. 2; col. 4, lines 25-38—the lead-in area, logical volume area, and UDF file system together constitute a predetermined navigation area. The CD and DVD formats are both logical and application formats);

wherein the record carrier is partitioned into at least a first partition for including first content of a first type and second partition for including second content of a second type so that a first access device accesses the first content and a second access device accesses the second content, the first type being different from the second type (col. 1, line 56 – col. 2, line 5—the record carrier is partitioned into an audio CD partition {or session} and a CD-ROM partition; these are two content types, each of which is accessed by a different access device).

Heo does not teach wherein said access means is arranged to write to said navigation area a location information of data accessed at a rate higher than an access pattern information for sequential data retrieval; and wherein space is dynamically moved between the first partition and the second partition, and wherein said access means is further configured to see all files of multiple formats included in the record carrier including recognizing a file having one format on the record carrier without understanding content of the file, and ignoring the file having the one format.

However, Ballantyne teaches an access means arranged to write to said navigation area a location information of data accessed at a rate higher than an access pattern information for sequential data retrieval (col. 13, lines 26-36 describes placing certain types of files towards the outer portion of the disk. These files, such as the .EXE {executable} files specifically cited, are desired to be accessed at a higher rate than sequential data, such as audio files. Col. 10, lines 10-13 further describes choosing locations for higher transfer rates, and col. 2, lines 43-54 explains the desirability of using a higher data rate for data files than for sequential data retrieval {such as audio data}. Col. 13, lines 57-60 shows writing the location information of these files to the navigation area {pointer table}).

All of these claimed elements were known in Heo and Ballantyne and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the writing location information of Ballantyne with the drive device and navigation area of Heo to yield the predictable result of a drive device wherein said access means is arranged to write to said navigation area a location information of data accessed at a rate higher than an access

pattern information for sequential data retrieval. One would be motivated to make this combination for the purpose of optimizing data access by placing different types of data in locations on the record carrier with inherently faster or slower data rates.

Heo/Ballantyne does not teach that space is dynamically moved between the first partition and the second partition, and wherein said access means is further configured to see all files of multiple formats included in the record carrier including recognizing a file having one format on the record carrier without understanding content of the file, and ignoring the file having the one format.

However, Abboud teaches that space is dynamically moved between the first partition and the second partition (col. 7, line 37 – col. 8, line 3—space is dynamically moved between the NOS partition and the float partition).

All of these claimed elements were known in Heo/Ballantyne and Abboud and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the dynamic partitioning of Abboud with the drive device and partitions of Heo/Ballantyne to yield the predictable result of a drive device in which space on the record carrier is dynamically moved between the first partition and the second partition. One would be motivated to make this combination to make efficient use of the limited space of the record carrier.

Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud does not teach said access means is further configured to see all files of multiple formats included in the record carrier including recognizing a file having one

format on the record carrier without understanding content of the file, and ignoring the file having the one format.

However, Puri teaches an access means that is configured to see all files of multiple formats included in the record carrier including recognizing a file having one format on the record carrier without understanding content of the file, and ignoring the file having the one format (col. 3, lines 12-31—all files are recognized, regardless of the format; if the format is not recognized, the file is ignored).

All of the claimed elements were thus known in Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud and Puri and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the recognizing and ignoring files of Puri with the access means of Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud to yield the predictable result of said access means being further configured to see all files of multiple formats included in the record carrier including recognizing a file having one format on the record carrier without understanding content of the file, and ignoring the file having the one format. One would be motivated to make this combination for the purpose of maintaining the recorded file structure while avoiding errors by not attempting to interpret a file of an unknown format.

Regarding Claim 3, Heo teaches said at least one predetermined parameter comprises a partition descriptor information for specifying at least one of a nature of each partition on said record carrier, a type of each partition on said record carrier, a space associated with each partition on said record carrier, a fragment allocation to each partition on said record carrier, and specific rules for recording on each partition on said record carrier (col. 4, lines 5-24—the CD

session and CD-ROM session constitute different partitions; the parameters specify recording formats such as the DVD/UDF format, which includes specific rules for recording on each partition).

Regarding Claim 4, Heo teaches said access means is configured to provide at least one of a read access and a write access to an application use area provided in said navigation area for storing an application specific information available to at least one of a physical layer, a logical layer and an application layer of said drive device (col. 5, line 61-col. 6, line 4—the DVD Application area in fig. 2 is an application use area in the navigation area, which the device can read for application specific information, such as determining the type of file system; this section describes access through the differentiation signal {physical layer} and DVD application formatter {application layer}).

Regarding Claim 9, Heo teaches said access means is arranged to use said navigation area for reserving space in a program area of said record carrier for specific file systems, allocation classes or applications (fig. 2; col. 4, lines 5-24—the navigation area reserves space for an audio CD application and a DVD application, with different file systems for each application).

Regarding Claim 10, Heo teaches said access means is arranged to use said navigation area for assigning properties or attributes to said reserved space (fig. 2; col. 4, lines 5-24—the file formats applied to the reserved space is a property of the space).

Regarding Claim 13, Heo teaches said access means is arranged to use said navigation area for selecting an application class for an application (col. 5, lines 21-30—the navigation area

is read to determine which application class is to be used to access the data on the disc—CD audio, CD video, CD-ROM, etc.)

Regarding Claim 15, Heo/Ballantyne does not teach said access means is arranged to use a dynamic partitioning for defining areas in said navigation area. However, Abboud teaches said access means is arranged to use a dynamic partitioning for defining areas in said navigation area (col. 7, lines 1-6).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the dynamic partitioning of Abboud with the drive device of and access means of Heo/Ballantyne as both are directed towards extending the functionality of drive devices. One would be motivated to make this combination for the purpose of allowing the dynamic adjusting of the partition size to accommodate the variable size of new applications (Abboud, col. 2, lines 43-46).

Regarding Claim 26, Heo teaches a method of reading from or writing to a record carrier (Abstract, lines 1-3), said method comprising the acts of:

providing on said record carrier a predetermined navigation area (fig. 2; col. 4, lines 25-38—the lead-in area, logical volume area, and UDF file system together constitute a predetermined navigation area);

writing on said navigation area at least one predetermined parameter specifying at least one of a logical format and an application format used on said record carrier (fig. 2; col. 4, lines 25-38—the CD and DVD formats are both logical and application formats); and

using said at least one predetermined parameter for at least one of a read access and a write access to said record carrier (col. 5, line 61-col. 6, line 4—the device uses the parameter to

determine which application and data format apply to the record carrier, and then reads and decodes the data) wherein the record carrier is partitioned into at least a first partition for including first content of a first type and second partition for including second content of a second type so that a first access device accesses the first content and a second access device accesses the second content, the first type being different from the second type (col. 1, line 56 – col. 2, line 5—the record carrier is partitioned into an audio CD partition {or session} and a CD-ROM partition; these are two content types, each of which is accessed by a different access device).

Heo does not teach:

presenting an application with the predetermined navigation area for writing desired data in the predetermined navigation area for allowing a device to recognize a file on the record carrier without understanding content of the file, and ignoring the file having the one format;

writing to said navigation area a location information of data accessed at a rate higher than an access pattern information for sequential data retrieval; and

wherein space is dynamically moved between the first partition and the second partition.

However, Ballantyne teaches writing to said navigation area a location information of data accessed at a rate higher than an access pattern information for sequential data retrieval (col. 13, lines 26-36 describes placing certain types of files towards the outer portion of the disk. These files, such as the .EXE {executable} files specifically cited, are desired to be accessed at a higher rate than sequential data, such as audio files. Col. 10, lines 10-13 further describes choosing locations for higher transfer rates, and col. 2, lines 43-54 explains the desirability of using a higher data rate for data files than for sequential data retrieval {such as

audio data}. Col. 13, lines 57-60 shows writing the location information of these files to the navigation area {pointer table}).

All of these claimed elements were known in Heo and Ballantyne and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the writing location information of Ballantyne with the drive device and navigation area of Heo to yield the predictable result of a method that includes writing to said navigation area a location information of data accessed at a rate higher than an access pattern information for sequential data retrieval. One would be motivated to make this combination for the purpose of optimizing data access by placing different types of data in locations on the record carrier with inherently faster or slower data rates.

Heo/Ballantyne does not teach presenting an application with the predetermined navigation area for writing desired data in the predetermined navigation area for allowing a device to recognize a file on the record carrier without understanding content of the file, and ignoring the file having the one format; and

that space is dynamically moved between the first partition and the second partition. However, Abboud teaches that space is dynamically moved between the first partition and the second partition (col. 7, line 37 – col. 8, line 3—space is dynamically moved between the NOS partition and the float partition).

All of these claimed elements were known in Heo/Ballantyne and Abboud and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to

combine the dynamic partitioning of Abboud with the record carrier of Heo/Ballantyne to yield the predictable result of a method in which space on the record carrier is dynamically moved between the first partition and the second partition. One would be motivated to make this combination to make efficient use of the limited space of the record carrier.

Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud does not teach presenting an application with the predetermined navigation area for writing desired data in the predetermined navigation area for allowing a device to recognize a file on the record carrier without understanding content of the file, and ignoring the file having the one format. However, Puri teaches presenting an application with the predetermined navigation area for writing desired data in the predetermined navigation area for allowing a device to recognize a file on the record carrier without understanding content of the file, and ignoring the file having the one format (col. 3, lines 12-31—all files are recognized, regardless of the format; if the format is not recognized, the file is ignored).

All of these claimed elements were thus known in Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud and Puri and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the recognizing and ignoring files of Puri with the method of Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud to yield the predictable result of presenting an application with the predetermined navigation area for writing desired data in the predetermined navigation area for allowing a device to recognize a file on the record carrier without understanding content of the file, and ignoring the file having the one format. One would be motivated to make this combination for the purpose of maintaining the recorded file structure while avoiding errors by not attempting to interpret a file of an unknown format.

Regarding Claim 28, Heo teaches presenting an application with the predetermined navigation area (col. 4, lines 26-38) and writing information to the navigation area (col. 3, lines 14-25), but Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud does not specifically teach said access means is further configured to present an application with the predetermined navigation area for writing desired data in the predetermined navigation area for allowing the drive device to recognize the file on the record carrier without understanding the content of the file.

However, Puri teaches an access means is further configured for allowing the drive device to recognize the file on the record carrier without understanding the content of the file (col. 3, lines 12-31—the drive device recognizes all files, whether or not it understands the content of the files).

All of the claimed elements were known in Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud and Puri and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the allowing a drive device to recognize a file without understanding its content of Puri with the navigation area and access means of Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud to yield the predictable result of an access means further configured to present an application with the predetermined navigation area for writing desired data in the predetermined navigation area for allowing the drive device to recognize a file on the record carrier without understanding content of the file.

7. Claims 2, 5, 7, 8, 11, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heo (U.S. Patent 6,901,210) in view of Ballantyne (U.S. Patent 6,693,869) in view of

Abboud (U.S. Patent 6,636,958) is view of Puri (U.S. Patent 6,260,043), as applied to Claims 1 and 9, above, and further in view of Acker (U.S. 2002/0181376).

Regarding Claim 2, Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri does not teach said at least one predetermined parameter comprises a disc descriptor information for specifying at least one of an identification of said record carrier, a type of said record carrier, and parameters applying to said record carrier as a whole. However, Acker teaches at least one predetermined parameter comprises a disc descriptor information for specifying at least one of an identification of said record carrier, a type of said record carrier, and parameters applying to said record carrier as a whole (fig. 7; ¶ [0058] ff.—specifically, Disc type ID is a type of the record carrier, and all of the listed parameters apply to the record carrier as a whole).

Both Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri and Acker teach parameters on a record carrier. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to substitute the disc descriptor information of Acker for the parameters of Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri to yield the predictable result of having the predetermined parameter comprise a disc descriptor for specifying parameters that apply to the disc as a whole.

Regarding Claim 5, Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri teaches accessing parameters in the navigation area, as described for Claim 1, above, but does not specifically teach said at least one parameter of said navigation area is accessible by at least one of a logical layer and an application layer of said drive device by using a predetermined access command. However, Acker teaches accessing the navigation area using predetermined access commands (¶ [0040], last 8 lines).

All of the claimed elements were known in Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri and Acker and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the accessing the navigation area with commands of Acker with the parameter access of Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri to yield the predictable result of said at least one parameter of said navigation area is accessible by at least one of a logical layer and an application layer of said drive device by using a predetermined access command.

Regarding Claim 7, Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri does not teach said access means is arranged to use pointers stored in said navigation area for partitioning said record carrier into separate areas. However, Acker teaches pointers uses for partitioning the record carrier into separate areas (§ [0004], lines 16-27—there is a pointer in the lead-in area {part of the navigation area} which points to the lead-out area, which in turn points to the start of the data for a session; sessions are separate areas on the record carrier. “Following the chain” indicates that these location indicators are pointers).

All of the claimed elements were known in Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri and Acker and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the pointers of Acker with the navigation area of Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri to yield the predictable result of using pointers stored in said navigation area for partitioning said record carrier into separate areas.

Regarding Claim 8, Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri does not specifically teach said access means is arranged to use said navigation area for determining the location of a starting address

number in the logical address space for said record carrier as a whole or for a specific application. However, Acker teaches said access means is arranged to use said navigation area for determining the location of a starting address number in the logical address space for said record carrier as a whole or for a specific application (§ [0135]—fig. 15 shows the starting address numbers for the record carrier as a whole and for the Data Zone, which is the address for a specific application).

All of the claimed elements were known in Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri and Acker and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the address determination of Acker with the navigation area of Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri to yield the predictable result of having the access means arranged to use said navigation area for determining the location of a starting address number in the logical address space for said record carrier as a whole or for a specific application.

Regarding Claim 11, Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri teaches said access means is arranged to use said navigation area (DN) for providing room for application specific data (Heo, fig. 2, User Area 23 is for application specific data, as shown in col. 4, lines 58-65), but does not specifically teach that the access means is arranged to use said navigation area for providing pointers into said reserved space. However, Acker teaches said access means is arranged to use said navigation area for providing pointers into said reserved space (§ [0004], lines 16-27, as for Claim 7, above).

All of the claimed elements were known in Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri and Acker and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It

therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the pointers of Acker with the application specific data area of Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri to yield the predictable result of an access means that uses the navigation area for providing room for application specific data and for providing pointers into said reserved space.

Regarding Claim 12, Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri does not teach said access means is arranged to use pointers stored in said navigation area for applying a seeking function. However, Acker teaches said access means is arranged to use pointers for applying a seeking function (§ [0121]—the search procedure is a seeking function; the use of pointers is shown in § [0004], lines 16-27).

All of the claimed elements were known in Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri and Acker and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the seeking function of Acker with the navigation area of Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri to yield the predictable result of an access means that uses pointers stored in the navigation area for applying a seeking function.

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heo (U.S. Patent 6,901,210) in view of Ballantyne (U.S. Patent 6,693,869) in view of Abboud (U.S. Patent 6,636,958) in view of Puri (U.S. Patent 6,260,043), as applied to Claim 1, above, and further in view of Auwens et al. (U.S. 2002/0131767, hereafter “Auwens”).

Regarding Claim 6, Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri teaches reading and writing information in the navigation area, as described for Claim 1, above, but does not teach said access means is arranged to provide a caching function for caching at least a part of the information provided on said navigation area. However, Auwens teaches caching control information recorded by a drive device (§ [0005], lines 16-22—buffering the control information is a caching function).

All of the claimed elements were known in Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri and Auwens and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine caching function of Auwens with the information in the navigation area of Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri to yield the predictable result of having the access means arranged to provide a caching function for caching at least a part of the information provided on said navigation area.

9. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heo (U.S. Patent 6,901,210) in view of Ballantyne (U.S. Patent 6,693,869) in view of Abboud (U.S. Patent 6,636,958) in view of Puri (U.S. Patent 6,260,043), as applied to Claim 1, above, and further in view of Senshu (U.S. 2003/0103429).

Regarding Claim 16, Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri does not teach said access means is arranged to apply a volume-based rights management to sessions of an information area of said record carrier. However, Senshu teaches said access means is arranged to apply a volume-based

rights management to sessions of an information area of said record carrier (§ [0014] and [0475]).

All of the claimed elements were known in Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri and Senshu and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the rights management of Senshu with the access means of Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri to yield the predictable result of a device with access means that applies volume-based rights management to sessions of an information area of the record carrier.

Regarding Claim 17, Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri does not teach said access means is arranged to apply a volume-based, partition-based or fragment-based defect management to sessions of an information area of said record carrier. However, Senshu teaches said access means is arranged to apply a volume-based, partition-based or fragment-based defect management to sessions of an information area of said record carrier (§ [0248] and [0250]).

All of the claimed elements were known in Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri and Senshu and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the defect management of Senshu with the access means of Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri to yield the predictable result of a device with an access means that applies defect management to sessions of an information area of the record carrier.

10. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heo (U.S. Patent 6,901,210) in view of Ballantyne (U.S. Patent 6,693,869) in view of Abboud (U.S. Patent

6,636,958) in view of Puri (U.S. Patent 6,260,043), as applied to Claim 1, above, and further in view of Rafanello (U.S. Patent 6,792,437).

Regarding Claim 18, Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri does not teach said drive device is a removable drive device for an optical disc. However, Rafanello teaches a drive device that is a removable drive device for an optical disc (col. 1, lines 29-34; also col. 3, lines 60-65).

All of the claimed elements were known in Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri and Rafanello and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the removable optical drive of Rafanello with the device of Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri to yield the predictable result of a drive device that is a removable drive device for an optical disc.

11. Claims 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heo (U.S. Patent 6,901,210) in view of Ballantyne (U.S. Patent 6,693,869) in view of Abboud (U.S. Patent 6,636,958) in view of Puri (U.S. Patent 6,260,043), as applied to Claim 1, above, and further in view of Printz et al. (U.S. 2003/0009334, hereafter "Printz").

Regarding Claim 19, Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri does not teach said drive device comprises a standard interface for storage devices. However, Printz teaches said drive device comprises a standard interface for storage devices (§ [0046]—the fixed storage is a drive device; PCMCIA, IDE, and CF are all standard interfaces).

All of the claimed elements were known in Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri and Printz and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It

therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the standard interface of Printz with the drive device of Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri to yield the predictable result of a drive device that comprises a standard interface for storage devices.

Regarding Claim 20, Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri does not teach said standard interface is a PCMCIA, Compact Flash, Newcard, or MMCA interface. However, Printz teaches said standard interface is a PCMCIA, Compact Flash, Newcard, or MMCA interface (§ [0046]).

All of the claimed elements were known in Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri and Printz and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the standard interface of Printz with the drive device of Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri to yield the predictable result of a drive device with a standard interface that is a PCMCIA, Compact Flash, Newcard, or MMCA interface.

12. Claims 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acker (U.S. 2002/0181376) in view of Heo et al. (U.S. Patent 6,901,210, hereafter “Heo”), further in view of Abboud (U.S. Patent 6,636,958), and further in view of Puri (U.S. Patent 6,260,043).

Regarding Claim 21, Acker teaches a record carrier for storing data on an information area thereof (Abstract, lines 1-2), wherein said information area comprises a navigation area for storing at least one predetermined parameter specifying at least one of a logical format and an application format used on said record carrier (§ [0004], lines 16-27—there is a pointer in the lead-in area which points to the lead-out area, which in turn points to the start of the data for a

session; sessions are separate areas on the record carrier. The lead-in area thus comprises a navigation area);

wherein said navigation area includes location information of data accessible at a rate higher than an access pattern information for sequential data retrieval (§ [0152]-[0154])—the maximum transfer rate for locations is recorded in the navigation area, with some data being accessed at a rate higher than that of sequential data retrieval, such as for audio CD data).

Acker does not teach the record carrier is partitioned into at least a first partition for including first content of a first type and second partition for including second content of a second type so that a first access device accesses the first content and a second access device accesses the second content, the first type being different from the second type, and wherein space is dynamically moved between the first partition and the second partition, and wherein said at least one predetermined parameter allows a device to recognize a file on the record carrier without understanding content of the file and to ignore the file having the one format.

However, Heo teaches the record carrier is partitioned into at least a first partition for including first content of a first type and second partition for including second content of a second type so that a first access device accesses the first content and a second access device accesses the second content, the first type being different from the second type (col. 1, line 56 – col. 2, line 5—the record carrier is partitioned into an audio CD partition {or session} and a CD-ROM partition; these are two content types, each of which is accessed by a different access device).

All of these claimed elements were known in Acker and Heo and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would

have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the at least two partitions of Heo with the record carrier of Acker to yield the predictable result of a record carrier which is partitioned into at least a first partition for including first content of a first type and second partition for including second content of a second type so that a first access device accesses the first content and a second access device accesses the second content, the first type being different from the second type. One would be motivated to make this combination for the purpose of allowing the use of the record carrier on both new and legacy devices by providing data in formats supported by each device.

Acker/Heo does not teach that space is dynamically moved between the first partition and the second partition, and wherein said at least one predetermined parameter allows a device to recognize a file on the record carrier without understanding content of the file and to ignore the file having the one format. However, Abboud teaches that space is dynamically moved between the first partition and the second partition (col. 7, line 37 – col. 8, line 3—space is dynamically moved between the NOS partition and the float partition).

All of these claimed elements were known in Acker/Heo and Abboud and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the dynamic partitioning of Abboud with the record carrier of Acker/Heo to yield the predictable result of a record carrier in which space is dynamically moved between the first partition and the second partition. One would be motivated to make this combination to make efficient use of the limited space of the record carrier.

Acker/Heo/Abboud does not teach said at least one predetermined parameter allows a device to recognize a file on the record carrier without understanding content of the file and to ignore the file having the one format. However, Puri teaches at least one predetermined parameter allows a device to recognize a file on the record carrier without understanding content of the file and to ignore the file having the one format (col. 3, lines 12-31—all files are recognized, regardless of the format; if the format is not recognized, the file is ignored).

All of the claimed elements were thus known in Acker/Heo/Abboud and Puri and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the recognizing and ignoring files of Puri with the record carrier of Acker/Heo/Abboud to yield the predictable result of a record carrier wherein said at least one predetermined parameter allows a device to recognize a file on the record carrier without understanding content of the file and to ignore the file having the one format. One would be motivated to make this combination for the purpose of maintaining the recorded file structure while avoiding errors by not attempting to interpret a file of an unknown format.

Regarding Claim 22, Acker teaches said navigation area is arranged in a lead in area of said information area (§ [0004], lines 16-27, as for Claim 21, above).

Regarding Claim 23, Acker teaches sessions provided in said information area are written without separate lead-in and lead-out area (fig. 19; § [0176])—only the first session has a lead-in area, and only the last session has a lead-out area).

Regarding Claim 24, Acker teaches sessions provided in said information area have a granularity of one fragment (§ [0038] and fig. 12, § [0121]-[0126])—a fragment can be defined as

any number of ECC blocks according to the present disclosure; the Session Map Block shown and described here can be considered a fragment, and sets the granularity of a session).

13. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acker (U.S. 2002/0181376) in view of Heo (U.S. Patent 6,901,210) in view of Abboud (U.S. Patent 6,636,958) in view of Puri (U.S. Patent 6,260,043), as applied to Claim 21, above, and further in view of Horie (U.S. 2002/0064111).

Regarding Claim 25, Acker/Heo/Abboud/Puri teaches sessions provided in said information area have a varying physical location (it is inherent that each session be recorded in a different physical location on the record carrier), but does not teach that sessions have varying size. However, Horie teaches that sessions have varying size (fig. 14, step M8; ¶ [0276]—since the device needs to determine the size of the session, sessions can clearly have varying size).

All of the claimed elements were known in Acker/Heo/Abboud/Puri and Horie and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine sessions of varying size of Horie with the record carrier of Acker/Heo/Abboud/Puri to yield the predictable result of a record carrier wherein sessions provided in said information area have at least one of a varying size and a varying physical location.

14. Claims 27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heo (U.S. Patent 6,901,210) in view of Ballantyne (U.S. Patent 6,693,869) in view of Abboud (U.S.

Patent 6,636,958) in view of Puri (U.S. Patent 6,260,043), as applied to Claims 1 and 26, above, and further in view of Lofgren et al. (U.S. Patent 6,081,447, hereafter "Lofgren").

Regarding Claims 27 and 31, Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri does not teach at least one predetermined parameter further specifies an allocation history of volatile files and, based on the history, said access means being further configured to re-allocate volatile files if written as many times as half an expected recyclability of the record carrier. However, Lofgren teaches an allocation history of volatile files and, based on the history, said access means being further configured to re-allocate volatile files if written as many times as half an expected recyclability of the record carrier (col. 4, lines 18-24 shows keeping an allocation history of volatile files. Col. 5, lines 25-30 shows relocating volatile files. Col. 5, lines 48-62 explains the limitations placed on when the reallocation of volatile files {wear leveling} should occur; this is detailed in col. 7, lines 51-61, which describes using the history and waiting a large number of rewrite cycles {the exact number is an adjustable parameter} before performing reallocation in order to maximize the life of the recording medium).

All of the claimed elements were known in Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri and Lofgren and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the reallocation of volatile files to maximize media life of Lofgren with the navigation area and parameters of Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri to yield the predictable result of having at least one predetermined parameter further specify an allocation history of volatile files and, based on the history, said access means being further configured to re-allocate volatile files if written as many times as half an expected recyclability of the record carrier.

15. Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acker (U.S. Patent 6,081,447) in view of Heo (U.S. Patent 6,901,210) in view of Abboud (U.S. Patent 6,636,958) in view of Puri (U.S. Patent 6,260,043), as applied to Claim 21, above, and further in view of Lofgren (U.S. Patent 6,081,447).

Regarding Claim 29, Acker/Heo/Abboud/Puri does not teach at least one predetermined parameter further specifies an allocation history of volatile files. However, Lofgren teaches at least one predetermined parameter further specifies an allocation history of volatile files (col. 4, lines 18-24).

All of the claimed elements were known in Acker/Heo/Abboud/Puri and Lofgren and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the reallocation of volatile files to maximize media life of Lofgren with the navigation area and parameters of Acker/Heo/Abboud/Puri to yield the predictable result of having at least one predetermined parameter further specify an allocation history of volatile files.

16. Claims 33 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heo (U.S. Patent 6,901,210) in view of Ballantyne (U.S. Patent 6,693,869) in view of Abboud (U.S. Patent 6,636,958) in view of Puri (U.S. Patent 6,260,043), as applied to Claims 1 and 26, above, and further in view of Everett et al. (U.S. Patent 6,526,475, hereinafter referred to as "Everett").

Regarding Claims 33 and 35, Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri does not teach presenting the application with a logical address space for writing in the logical address space so that

different devices overwrite content stored by other applications. However, Everett teaches presenting the application with a logical address space for writing in the logical address space so that different devices overwrite content stored by other applications (col. 2, lines 7-13).

All of the claimed elements were known in Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri and Everett and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the overwriting of content of Everett with the access means and method of Heo/Ballantyne/Abboud/Puri to yield the predictable result of presenting the application with a logical address space for writing in the logical address space so that different devices overwrite content stored by other applications. One would be motivated to make this combination to permit, at least in a limited fashion, handling of files from one application by apparatus effecting a different application (Everett, col. 1, lines 33-40).

17. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acker (U.S. 2002/0181376) in view of Heo (U.S. Patent 6,901,210) in view of Abboud (U.S. Patent 6,636,958) in view of Puri (U.S. Patent 6,260,043), as applied to Claim 21, above, and further in view of Everett (U.S. Patent 6,526,475)

Regarding Claim 34, Acker/Heo/Abboud/Puri does not teach wherein an application is presented with a logical address space for writing in the logical address space so that different devices overwrite content stored by other applications. However, Everett teaches wherein an application is presented with a logical address space for writing in the logical address space so that different devices overwrite content stored by other applications (col. 2, lines 7-13).

All of the claimed elements were known in Acker/Hco/Abboud/Puri and Everett and could have been combined by known methods with no change in their respective functions. It therefore would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the overwriting of content of Everett with the access means and method of Acker/Hco/Abboud/Puri to yield the predictable result of presenting the application with a logical address space for writing in the logical address space so that different devices overwrite content stored by other applications. One would be motivated to make this combination to permit, at least in a limited fashion, handling of files from one application by apparatus effecting a different application (Everett, col. 1, lines 33-40).

Response to Amendment

18. Regarding the new limitations in Claims 1, 21, and 26, new prior art reference Puri (U.S. Patent 6,260,043) teaches an access means that is configured to see all files of multiple formats included in the record carrier including recognizing a file having one format on the record carrier without understanding content of the file, and ignoring the file having the one format (col. 3, lines 12-31—all files are recognized, regardless of the format; if the format is not recognized, the file is ignored).

Response to Arguments

19. The amendments to Claim 21 are accepted as overcoming the rejections of Claims 21-25, 29, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph of the Office Action mailed 23 July 2008; these rejections are hereby withdrawn.

20. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 21, and 26 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The examiner agrees with the applicant's assertion that Wilkes does not teach the newly added limitations to the present claims, specifically, recognizing a file on the record carrier without understanding content of the file and to ignore the file having the one format. As the applicant states, Wilkes teaches a system that understands the content of all of the files it recognizes. However, new prior art reference Puri teaches this new limitation, as detailed above. As required by the present claims, Puri recognizes all of the files on a record carrier, working with the ones whose content it understands and ignoring the ones whose content it does not understand. Puri also teaches the limitations of Claim 28, formerly rejected in view of Wilkes (U.S. 2003/0033051).

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. This art includes Maeda et al. (U.S. 2003/0196027), which teaches a record carrier with a parameter that allows the recognition of a file without understanding the format of the file.

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HAL SCHNEE whose telephone number is (571)270-1918. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. E.S.T..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew M. Kim can be reached on (571) 272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Matt Kim/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2186